

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the prior art. More specifically, Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15-18 and 21-27 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,036,484 (McCoy) in view of the prior art discussed in the present application. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12 and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over McCoy in view of the prior art discussed in the application and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,812,768 (Page, et al.); and Claims 1, 14 and 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over McCoy in view of the prior art discussed in the application and further in view of Official Notice.

Also, Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite on the basis that the claims do not clearly indicate what the term "IMS" means, and that the phrase "said IMS program" does not have the proper antecedent basis.

Neither of Claims 2 or 9 was rejected over the prior art, and the Examiner indicated that both of these claims would be allowable if appropriately rewritten in independent form.

Claims 2 and 9 are herein being rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations, respectively, of Claims 1 and 8. Care has also been taken to address the rejection of Claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112. In particular, Claims 2 and 9 both now indicate that "IMS" represents "information mangement system," and both claims set forth "an IMS program" in the preamble of the claim. This provides the appropriate antecedent basis for the later use of the phrase "said IMS program" in the claims. In view of these changes to Claims 2 and 9, the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objections to these claims and the rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, and to allow Claims 2 and 9.

In addition, independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 26 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. For the reasons set forth below, Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-27 are clear and definite and also patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-27 under 35 U.S.C. §§103 and 112, and to allow these claims.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, the preamble of each of the independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 26 is being amended to describe "an information management system (IMS) program." This clearly indicates what is meant by IMS, and also provides the appropriate antecedent basis for the term "the IMS program" later in the claims.

In view of these amendments, Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-27 are clear and definite and fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. The Examiner is, consequently, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of these Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-27 patentably distinguish over the prior art because the prior art does not disclose or suggest logical page part of this invention, as described in the claims. In order to better understand this, Applicants believe it may be helpful to discuss this invention and the prior art.

As explained in detail in the present application, this invention generally relates to procedures for mapping from a first program written in a first language to a second program written in a second language. To do this, the invention generates and uses an interface. The interface, among other matters, translates data types from the first language to the

second language, formats data from the first language to the second language, and takes care of other requirements needed to share data between the two languages.

One important specific aspect of the interface is referred to as a logical page, or lpage. The lpage provides for the dynamic composing or reading of an IMS message. This ability to process dynamically the IMS message is what distinguishes the invention from the prior art, including McCoy and Page, et al.

For example, McCoy discloses a method and system for connecting a personal computer to a host system in a way that allows data in the host system to be extracted by the personal computer, manipulated by that personal computer, and then returned to the host system.

While data is sent between the personal computer and the host system, this reference does not teach the use of a logical page as discussed above, as part of an interface, which is generated as the result of scanning an IMS transaction, and which is used to translate data from one program in one language to another program in another language.

Page, et al, discloses an architecture for a service broker, which brokers services between a client and a server and allows for adapters that can convert foreign communications protocol to the function server protocol. The adapter would be necessary when exposing existing IMS services. Page, et al, though, does not describe how to accomplish this, and Page, et al, does not allow for the dynamic size of IMS messages.

Independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 26 clearly describe the above-discussed difference between this invention and the prior art. Claims 1, 8 and 22 describe the interface as comprising a logical page part which provided for dynamic composing or reading an IMS message. Claims 15, 17, 24 and 26 also describe this logical page part.

Claims 15 and 24 describe means for scanning an IMS transaction, and describe the feature that this means for scanning includes a logical page part which provides for dynamic composing or reading an IMS message.

Claim 17 sets forth instruction means for composing or reading IMS input and output messages, and further sets forth the limitation that this instruction means includes a logical page part which provides for dynamic composing or reading an IMS message. Similarly, Claim 26 describes means for composing or reading IMS input and output messages, and indicates that this means includes a logical page part which provides for dynamic composing or reading an IMS message.

This feature of the invention may be used to enable a processing of a dynamic IMS message, where the structure of a message is known, but its content is variant. As an example, an IMS message may contain lpages, where the order of the lpages is known, but an lpage itself can repeat. An lpage contains segments; and in any given segment sequence, one or more of the segments may be omitted. A segment has fields; and some or all of the fields can be omitted in a segment. Fields can have different types, for instance, any type that is possible for COBOL. Because of this, the marshalling for a field may involve conversion of characters, different number types and more.


Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 26, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable.

Claims 3-7 and 21 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith, and Claims 10-14 are dependent from Claim 8 and are allowable therewith. Claim 16 is dependent from, and is allowable with, Claim 15; and Claims 18-20 are dependent from

Claim 17 and are allowable therewith. Also, Claim 23 is dependent from Claim 22 and is allowable therewith, Claim 25 is dependent from and is allowable with Claim 24, and Claim 27 is dependent from, and is allowable with Claim 26. Hence, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow these claims.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, and the rejection of Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103. The Examiner is further requested to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to Claims 2 and 9, and to allow Claims 1-27. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy